

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this amendment, the application included claims 1-66. No claims have been amended, canceled or added. Hence, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-66 stand pending for examination.

Claims 1-66 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-52 of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,446 to Kausik et al. (“Kausik ‘446”).

Claims 1-66 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,956,950 to Kausik (“Kausik ‘950”).

Claims 1-66 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4-20, 23-31 and 34-43 of co-pending U.S. Application No. 09/874,795 to Hird (“Hird”).

Double Patenting

The Applicants respectfully traverse the claim rejections because the double patenting rejections are believed to be improper. In rejecting claims 1-66 in view of Kausik ‘446, for example, the Office Action addresses only “wherein said candidate secret comprises a pseudo-valid secret configured to camouflage said secret if said candidate password is not said password” and “said candidate secret has the structural form of a private key.” The Office Action appears to state that these elements are anticipated by “said server is configured to store said authentication credential in cryptographically camouflaged form.” The Applicants submit that the quoted passage does not anticipate the claim elements and respectfully requests further clarification. Moreover, the pending claims include other elements not addressed by the Office Action. The Applicants, therefore, maintain that the double patenting rejection in view of Kausik ‘446 is invalid.

In rejecting claims 1-66 in view of Kausik '950, the Office Action states that “wherein said candidate secret comprises a pseudo-valid secret configured to camouflage said secret if said candidate password is not said password” and “said candidate secret has the structural form of a private key” are anticipated by “wherein a pseudo-key is a key that conforms to the predetermined key format but does not match the private key.” The Applicants submit that the quoted passage does not anticipate the claim elements and respectfully requests further clarification. Moreover, the pending claims include other elements not addressed by the Office Action. The Applicants, therefore, maintain that the double patenting rejection in view of Kausik '950 is invalid.

In rejecting claims 1-66 in view of Hird, the Office Action states that “wherein said candidate secret comprises a pseudo-valid secret configured to camouflage said secret if said candidate password is not said password” and “said candidate secret has the structural form of a private key” are anticipated by “generation-camouflaging at least a portion of said access-controlled datum, wherein said output datum is a function of the input access code.” The Applicants submit that the quoted passage does not anticipate the claim elements and respectfully requests further clarification. Moreover, the pending claims include other elements not addressed by the Office Action. The Applicants, therefore, maintain that the double patenting rejection in view of Hird is invalid.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 9, 2007

/Irvin E. Branch/

Irvin E. Branch

Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111-3834

Tel: 303-571-4000

Fax: 415-576-0300

IEB/jln

61192090 v1